

REMARKS

GENERALLY

This current Reply is responsive to a current and Final Office Action dated 03/30/2007. In this current Office Action, pending claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-32 were examined, and all pending claims were rejected.

Claims 10 and 29 are canceled by this Reply without prejudice. New claims 33-36 are added. Support for the new claims may be found throughout the original Disclosure and in particular at Page 22, Lines 14-20 and at Figure 6 and related text on pages 22-24.

Thus, claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-28, and 30-36 are now presented for examination.

OFFICE ACTION REJECTION(S)

Generally, the current Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 6-14, and 16-32 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). The current Office Action reads at paragraph #4 and paragraph #5 on page 2 and page 13, respectively:

4. Claims 1, 2, 6-14, 19-28, and 30-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Price et al. (hereinafter "Price"), "Linking By Inking: Trailblazing in a Paper-like Hypertext", HyperText 98, Pittsburgh, PA.

1 copyrightACM 1998, p. 30-39, in view of Garrett, U.S. Patent No. 7,107,261 B2,
2 issued September 2006.

3 5. Claims 3, 4, 16-18, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)
4 as being unpatentable over Price in view of Garrett as applied to claims 1, 2, 6-
5 14, 19-28, and 30-32 above, and further in view of Haveliwala et al. (hereinafter
6 "Haveliwala"), "Evaluating Strategies for Similarity Search on the Web",
7 WWW2002, May 2002, p. 432-442.
8

9 ARGUMENT(S) AGAINST THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTIONS

10 AND ARGUMENT(S) FOR THE PATENTABILITY OF THE PENDING CLAIMS

11 I. The arguments against the applicability of Garrett are re-presented
12 herein.

13 The arguments generally against the applicability of Garrett are as follows:
14

15 A. Garrett does not teach weighting words in any manner.
16 B. Garrett does not teach having a history of search terms.
17

18 The details of these arguments are incorporated by reference herein from
19 the previous Reply.
20

1 II. None of the art of record teaches determining keywords that are
2 likely to be of interest to a user based on words contained in documents previously
3 accessed by the user.

4

5 By way of example, dependent claim 10 (which has been amended into
6 claim 1) read as follows:

7 10. (original) The method as recited in claim 1, wherein the
8 locating information related to the annotation further comprises:

9 determining keywords that are likely to be of interest to a user
10 based on the annotation and words contained in previous documents
accessed by the user; and

11 using the keywords to locate information.

12

13 In the current Office Action, the rejection of claim 10 reads as follows on
Pages 5 and 6 (with bold highlighting removed):

14

15 Regarding dependent claim 10, Price teaches that tapping on a source
ink anchor, i.e., annotation, produces a list of clippings that contain matching
target ink anchors, or clippings of documents that correspond to multiple
annotations made by the reader (p. 35, "Ink Anchors", especially Col. 1, par. 7).
Price teaches determining keywords from annotations made by the user.

16

17 The cited paragraph of Price pertains to finding "a list of clippings that
contain matching target ink anchors." The "source ink anchor" may be used to
find previous documents, but keywords determined to likely be of interest to a user
based on words contained in the previously-accessed documents are not used to
locate information.

1 Hence, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 1 is allowable
2 over the art of record. For similar reasons, independent claims 14 and 23 are
3 likewise allowable.

4

5 Moreover, new claims 33, 34, 35, and 36 include element(s) directed to
6 detecting user input of a gesture that is associated with a search task. It is
7 respectfully submitted that at least these element(s), in conjunction with the other
8 elements of their respective claims, are not described or suggested by the art of
9 record, either alone or in any combination.

10

11

12 For the reasons provided above, it is respectfully submitted that independent
13 claims 1, 14, and 23 are allowable. Moreover, although each of the pending
14 dependent claims also includes additional element(s) militating toward
15 allowability, they are allowable at least for the reasons given above in connection
16 with their respective independent claims.

17

18

19 Accordingly, withdrawal of the § 103(a) rejections is hereby respectfully
20 requested.

CONCLUSION

It is respectfully submitted that all of pending claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-28, and 30-36 are allowable. Consequently, allowance of claims 1-4, 6-9, 11-14, 16-28, and 30-36 is hereby respectfully requested.

If the next communication from the Office is not to include an indication of allowable subject matter, the undersigned representative of the Applicant respectfully requests a telephonic interview with the Examiner.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: 30 Aug 2007

By: Keith W. Saunders
Keith W. Saunders
Reg. No. 41,462
(509) 324-9256 x238